



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,822	12/24/2003	Hung Chen Kao	4459-138	1150

7590

04/13/2005

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP
Suite 310
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

CRANSON JR, JAMES W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/743,822

Applicant(s)

KAO, HUNG CHEN

Examiner

James W. Cranson

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-10, 12, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 11, 13-15 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/24/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 5,7,12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2002/0113918 A1 to Hiratsuka et al. A direct light type planar light source apparatus and liquid crystal display device that includes second frame detachable from first frame and plural light sources is disclosed in 2002/0113918 A1 by Hiratsuka et al.

Regarding claim 1

A back light module for a liquid crystal display (1) having a liquid crystal panel (3) comprising:

Art Unit: 2875

a first frame (41);
a second frame (42) detachable coupling with the first frame (abstract, [0033])
a plurality of lamps [0012, 424] disposed in the second frame for transmitting light; and
a first optical (43) component on first frame, wherein first frame is disposed between
second frame and the liquid crystal panel (figure 1).

Regarding claims 5, according to claim 1, and claim 7, according to claim 5, wherein first
optical component is optical films and diffuser plate [0026, “one or more diffusion sheets
can be placed between front frame and rear frame”]

Regarding claim 12

A liquid crystal display (1) comprising:

a liquid crystal panel (3) for displaying images;
a first frame (41) receiving the liquid crystal panel (3);
a second frame (42) detachable coupling (abstract, [0033]) with the first frame, second
frame having plurality of lamps (424) for transmitting light to LCP ; and
a first optical component (43) on first frame, wherein first frame is disposed between
second frame and the liquid crystal panel (figure 1).

Regarding claim 16, according to claim 12, wherein first optical component comprises
a plurality of optical films and a diffuser plate [0026, “one or more diffusion sheets
can be placed between front frame and rear frame”].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Regarding claim 6, wherein optical sheet is a prism sheet;

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0113918 to Hiratsuka in view of USPN 6,609,807 to Torihara et al. Hiratsuka does not disclose a prism sheet. Torihara teaches the use of a prism sheet in a backlight and liquid crystal display device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Hiratsuka with a prism sheet as taught by Torihara. The reason as taught by Torihara in the abstract is for converting the brightness distribution into a predetermined brightness distribution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-10, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0113918 to Hiratsuka et al.

Regarding claims 8, according to claim 1, and claim 17, according to claim 12, wherein first frame has first slot for first optical component (figure 1)

Art Unit: 2875

Regarding claims 9, according to claim 1, and claim 18, according to claim 12, wherein second frame has second optical component, Hiratsuka discloses that he has one or more optical components.

Regarding claim 11, according to claim 9, wherein second optical component is a diffuser Hiratsuka discloses second component as diffuser

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4, 10,13-15,19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 2, according to claim 1, and claim 13 according to claim 12, add a neck protrusion on first frame and second frame and a neck groove paired with neck protrusion which is on the other one of first frame and second frame. This combination of limitations is not found or taught in the art of record. Claims 3,4, 14 and 15 depend from claims 2 and 13 and would be allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 10, according to claim 1, and claim 19, according to claim 12, add that second frame has a second slot for second optical component. These limitations combined with the independent claim limitations are not found or taught in the art of record.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James W. Cranson whose telephone number is 571-272-2368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30A.M.- 5:00P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandy O'Shea can be reached on 571-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).




THOMAS M. SEMBER
PRIMARY EXAMINER